



POLICY UPDATE

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

<http://www.icann.org/topics/policy/>

Volume 13, Issue 4 – May 2013 Issue

Across ICANN

[Issues Currently Open for Public Comment](#)

ccNSO

[ccNSO Thanks Departing Councilors, Welcomes New Ones](#)

[ccNSO Adopts Internationalized Domain Name Policy Recommendations](#)

[ccNSO Members Rate Beijing Meeting Highly](#)

[ccNSO Council Asks for Two-Panel Evaluation of IDN Fast Track](#)

[One Web Page for All ccNSO Post-Beijing Meeting Materials](#)

[Watch ccNSO Video](#)

[ccNSO Assesses Translation Needs](#)

[13 ccNSO Members Allocated Travel Funds to South Africa Meeting](#)

[Workload Management Method In Place](#)

[ccNSO Weighs In on Delegation and Re-delegation Performance Standards](#)

GNSO

[Whois Studies Near Completion](#)

[GNSO to Tackle Policy vs. Implementation – Call for Volunteers](#)

ASO

[ASO Met in April, Finishing Due Diligence for Board Member Selection](#)

At-Large

[At-Large Community Achievements during ICANN's 46th Meeting in Beijing](#)

[ALAC Submits Seven Policy Advice Statements in mid-March and late-April](#)

GAC

[GAC Advice on New gTLDs Delivered in Beijing](#)

RSSAC

[RSSAC Restructure Underway](#)

SSAC

[SSAC Overview](#)

Read in Your Preferred Language

ICANN Policy Update is available in all six official languages of the United Nations. *Policy Update* is posted on ICANN's [website](#) and is available via online subscription. To receive the *Update* in your Inbox each month, visit the ICANN [subscriptions page](#), enter your e-mail address, and select "Policy Update" to subscribe. This service is free.

[ICANN Policy Update Statement of Purpose](#)

Send questions, comments and suggestions to: policy-staff@icann.org.

Policy Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Address Supporting Organization	ASO
Country Code Names Supporting Organization	ccNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization	GNSO
At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC
Governmental Advisory Committee	GAC
Root Server System Advisory Committee	RSSAC

Across ICANN

Issues Currently Open for Public Comment

Numerous public comment periods are currently open on issues of interest to the ICANN community. Act now to share your views on such topics as:

[Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings – Initial Report.](#)

What is a good process for preventing a domain name from being switched from a registrar or registrant during a formal dispute resolution? Reply period ends 17 May.

[Questions to the Community on Accountability and Transparency within ICANN.](#)

A group of volunteers ask ICANN community members to answer 24 questions rating ICANN's efforts toward greater accountability and transparency. Comment period ends 19 May; reply period ends 9 June.

[ICANN's FY 14 Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework.](#) This annual report describes ICANN's role in the ecosystem and priorities for the next fiscal year in promoting a healthy, stable and resilient unique identifier system. Reply period ends 20 May.

[Proposed Final New gTLD Registry Agreement.](#) The agreement governing the rights and obligations between ICANN and new gTLD registries has been revised. Comment period ends 21 May; reply period ends 11 June.

[Proposed Modification of GNSO Operating Procedures Concerning the Deadline for the Submission of Reports and Motions.](#) The GNSO Council recommends changes to clarify deadlines for reports and motions. Comment period ends 24 May; reply period ends 14 June.

[Consultation on Root Zone KSK Rollover.](#) What factors should be considered in planning for a KSK rollover in the Root Zone, as part of the IANA functions? Reply period ends 31 May.

[Proposed Final 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement.](#) This agreement, revised after intensive negotiations, binds ICANN and registrars of domains to a number of provisions. Reply period closes 4 June.

[New gTLD Board Committee Consideration of GAC Safeguard Advice.](#) How should the Board Committee address the GAC advice that six safeguards, such as Whois verification and security checks, should be broadly applied to all new gTLDs? Reply period closes 4 June.

[FY14 Community Travel Support Guidelines.](#) Guidelines describing which groups are supported for how many travelers, and what costs will be covered are posted annually for review. Reply period ends 11 June.

For the full list of issues open for public comment, plus recently closed and archived public comment forums, visit the [Public Comment web page](#).

The staff also populates a web page to help preview potential “upcoming” public comment opportunities. The recently updated ["Public Comments - Upcoming" page](#) provides information about potential future public comment opportunities. The page is designed to be updated after every ICANN Public Meeting to help individuals and the community to set priorities and plan their future workloads.

ccNSO

ccNSO Thanks Departing Councilors, Welcomes New Ones



At a Glance

Three new Councilors take on positions made open by departing members.

Recent Developments

During the Beijing meeting, three Councilors departed from the ccNSO and three new Councilors took their posts on the Council.

Next Steps

The three new Councilors will serve until March 2016.

Background

Fernando Espana, .us; Paulos Nyirenda, .mw and Rolando Toledo, .pe left the Council and were replaced with Becky Burr, .us; Demi Getschko, .br and [Abibu Ntahigiye](#), .tz.

The nominations and elections to these positions took place in October/November 2012. Three Councilors per region are represented on the ccNSO Council, plus three NomCom appointees.

Becky Burr previously served six years as a NomCom appointee, so she was welcomed back to the Council.

More Information

- [ccNSO Council Members](#)
- [Council Elections Information](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccNSO Adopts Internationalized Domain Names Policy Recommendations

At a Glance

The ccNSO Council has adopted recommendations from its policy development process on Internationalized Domain Names.

Recent Developments

At its April meeting, the ccNSO Council unanimously adopted all Final Report recommendations. As a result two long-standing working groups (IDN ccPDP WG 1 and 2) were closed.

Next Steps

The members of the ccNSO will vote on the Council Recommendation prior to the upcoming Durban meeting. In terms of the [graphical representation](#) [PDF, 2 MB] of the ccNSO PDP, the process has reached the ccNSO members vote stage.

Background

In April 2009, the ccNSO Council initiated the IDN ccPDP, and followed the advice of the IDN ccPDP Issue Manager, to appoint two working groups, each with its own charter, working method and schedule:

	Purpose
Working Group 1	Study and report on feasible overall policy for selection and delegation of Internationalized Domain Name top-

	level domains. Guided by the joint GAC-ccNSO Issues Paper and comments received on that document, the Final Report of the IDNC Working Group and the associated Fast Track Implementation Plan and experience with the Fast Track Process.
Working Group 2	Report on changes to Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws to include IDN ccTLD managers in the ccNSO. This was necessitated by the delegation of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process and in future under the policy recommended by WG1.

The IDN ccPDP WG 1 focused on, without limitation, the proposals and recommendations of the 2008 IDN Committee Working Group and the Implementation Plan based on the work of the IDN Committee WG, and has taken into account the experiences with and reviews of the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. The IDN ccPDP WG 2 focused on, without limitation, examination of Article IX of the ICANN Bylaws and associated Annexes (Annex B and C of the ICANN Bylaws). It took into account the proposals and recommendations of IDN ccPDP WG 1.

More Information

- [Members Report containing the ccNSO Council Recommendation](#)
- [Interim Report and Public Comment period](#)
- [Draft recommendations of IDN ccPDP WG 1, comments and summary of comments and analysis](#)
- [Draft recommendations of IDN ccPDP WG 2, comments and summary of comments and analysis](#)
- [Final paper and further information on the work of IDN ccPDP WG 1](#)
- [Final Paper and further information on the work of IDN ccPDP WG 2](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

ccNSO Members Rate Beijing Meeting Highly

At a Glance

ccNSO meeting evaluation scores were posted, revealing the highest satisfaction level of all surveys so far.

Recent Developments

The results of the ccNSO Meeting Survey have now been published. Compared to previous surveys, the ccNSO Meeting in Beijing was the most successful.

Next Steps

The ccNSO Meetings Program Working Group will evaluate the results, which help them to shape future agendas, with the hope to improve the results even further.

Background

Every session during ccNSO Meeting Days 1 and 2 are surveyed amongst the participants. Participants are asked to score how satisfied they are with the quality of the various sessions and the meeting overall. It is a valuable tool for helping the Meetings Program Working Group to shape upcoming ccNSO Meeting agendas.

More Information

- [Beijing meeting survey results](#)
- [Previous meeting survey results](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccNSO Council Asks for Two-Panel Evaluation of IDN Fast Track

At a Glance

ccNSO Council requests Board to implement two-panel evaluation method in IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process

Recent Developments

Following the adoption of the IDN ccPDP recommendations, the ccNSO Council requested the ICANN Board of Directors to implement, on an experimental basis, the two-panel process for confusing similarity review.

Background

In the context of the formal policy developed by the ccNSO for the selection of IDN ccTLDs, the experience from the Fast Track Process has been used to review and expand the criteria and methodology for determining confusing similarity. Under the IDN ccPDP the implementation of a two-panel system is proposed, where both panels would be external and independent. The second panel, named the Extended Process Similarity Panel, would provide a final validation and review opportunity relating to any confusing similarity.

More Information

- [Final Report of the IDN ccPDP](#) [PDF, 375KB]

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

One Web Page for All ccNSO Post-Beijing Meeting Materials

At a Glance

All ccNSO post-Beijing meeting materials are now gathered on one web page.

Recent Developments

After every ICANN Public Meeting, the ccNSO Secretariat gathers all relevant meeting-related material on one web page in order to make it easy for Community members to find what they need. Typical meeting materials include a meeting report, presentations, recordings, transcripts and the results of the ccNSO Meetings Survey.

More Information

- [ccNSO Beijing Meeting Materials web page](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Watch ccNSO Video

At a Glance

The ccNSO has produced a YouTube presentation of activities during the Beijing meeting.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO Meetings in Beijing have been documented in video format.

Background

It has become a tradition that the ccNSO Secretariat summarizes the ccNSO Meeting in a video format.

More Information

- [Watch the video](#)

Staff Contact

[Kristina Nordström](#), ccNSO Secretariat

ccNSO Assesses Translation Needs

At a Glance

ccNSO surveyed its members to gauge the need for translation of ccNSO related documents.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO surveyed its members to find out what needs there are in the community to translate ccNSO related documents.

The results show that although only a minority (less than 1/3) of the respondents think translations are needed, there is a demand for translation of policy papers and rules and guideline documents. The majority of respondents think that meeting documents do not need to be translated by a certified translator, but can be provided through standard translation services. The most popular language for potential translation is Spanish.

Based on this, the ccNSO Council asked the Secretariat to look into translation tools that could be used for the ccNSO website.

Next Steps

The ccNSO Secretariat is now looking into translation tools that can be used in the future.

Background

In 2011, the ICANN Board ccNSO Review Working Group suggested in their final Implementation report that the ccNSO should consider the translation of its documents. This recommendation was the result of the independent review of the ccNSO.

As part of the implementation process and following the Implementation Plan, the ccNSO Council decided to launch a survey to get a better understanding from the ccTLD community on the current needs for translations as well as associated costs and benefits.

More Information

- [ccNSO Review Working Group Final Implementation Report](#) [PDF, 301KB]
- [Survey results](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

13 ccNSO Members Allocated Travel Funds to South Africa Meeting

At a Glance

ccNSO Travel Fund Committee appointed funded travellers to the ICANN Meeting in Durban, South Africa during 14 to 18 July 2013.

Recent Developments

The candidates who are to receive either full or part ccNSO travel funding to the Durban meeting have now been selected.

Next Steps

The call for ccNSO Travel Funding Applications to the Buenos Aires Meeting 17 to 21 November 2013 is scheduled to start on 5 July 2013.

Background

The ccNSO travel funding program aims at advancing the work of the ccNSO as a whole and is therefore aimed at supporting community members that are contributing towards its work. As the ccNSO has only limited travel funding, necessary emphasis is put on how much the applicant is able to contribute towards the work of the ccNSO. Hence, those applicants who actively contribute but would not be able to do so without travel funding are given priority when allocating funding.

More Information

- [List of ccNSO members receiving travel funding](#)

Staff Contact

[Gabriella Schitteck](#), ccNSO Secretariat

Workload Management Method In Place

At a Glance

ccNSO Council has introduced a workload management methodology.

Recent Developments

At its meeting in Beijing the ccNSO Council adopted the Final Report of the ccNSO Council Capacity Study Group. As a result, the ccNSO guidelines for creation of working groups and work plans have been updated.

Next Steps

The ccNSO Council will experiment with a prioritization model to manage and balance the ccNSO workload and availability of volunteers.

More Information

- [Guidelines](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

ccNSO Weighs In on Delegation and Re-delegation Performance Standards

At a Glance

ccNSO Council has provided input on delegation and re-delegation Performance Standards.

Recent Developments

The ccNSO Council submitted comments on the delegation and re-delegation Performance Standards - part of a series of efforts from ICANN to establish performance standards for the delivery of the IANA functions, as required by the contract between ICANN and the NTIA. The ccNSO comments were not directed at the questions raised as part of the consultation process, but rather raised some contextual issues. In particular the ccNSO Council noted:

- The value of the ongoing work of the ccNSO Framework of Interpretation WG;
- Differences in individual delegations and re-delegations cases and their frequency argue against a “one size fits all” approach to the process; and
- That thoroughness, probity and transparency may be additional (or more appropriate) performance measures than timeliness and accuracy.

Background

The ccNSO Council welcomed the opportunity to comment on ICANN's consultation on ccTLD delegation and re-delegation standards because ccTLDs represent a significant and active proportion of IANA's stakeholder community, specifically in relation to IANA's role in the maintenance of the DNS root zone. The stable, reliable, accurate and effective execution of the IANA functions is of utmost importance to ccTLD managers.

More Information

- [Full submission of the ccNSO Council](#)
- [Other submissions](#)

Staff Contact

[Bart Boswinkel](#), ccNSO Senior Policy Advisor

GNSO

Whois Studies Near Completion

At a Glance

The Whois Studies commissioned by the GNSO Council are entering their final stages. With work that began three years ago, the studies are being finalized and the results shared with the ICANN community. This will aid in the preparation of data-driven policy decisions.

Next Steps

After a public comment period and response period, Whois Study 2, Registrant Identification, expects to have its Final Report published this month.

Whois Study 1, the Whois Misuse Study has been conducted by Carnegie Mellon University and they are now drafting their initial report. This report is expected to be available for public comment in June, with a public comment period that will extend beyond the ICANN Public Meeting in Durban. The complete final report is expected by August.

Whois Study 3, Privacy and Proxy Abuse, is still underway with the National Physical Laboratory (NPL) of the United Kingdom. They anticipate concluding their work mid-year, and will publish their results for public comment in the third quarter of 2013.

NORC at the University of Chicago is continuing to assess their findings and its draft report will be available later this year for public comment.

Background

The Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (Whois) is an Internet standard mechanism for providing public access to identity and contact information about domain name registrants. ICANN-accredited domain name registrars are contractually obligated to provide accurate information about all registrants via Whois, either directly or through a generic top-level domain (gTLD) registry. Some registrars and third-party service providers offer registrants the opportunity to limit the public disclosure of their personal contact information by offering privacy services that publish alternative contact information. Other providers act as “proxies” by registering domain names for another user, who may access and use the domain name through a separate arrangement with the proxy service provider.

Over time, the public information requirement and the use of proxy and privacy services have led to debates among privacy and data protection advocates and law enforcement and intellectual property interests over access to domain name registrant data. This issue has been challenging to address, and in the absence of accurate and authoritative information about the way in which registrant contact information access is affected by the use of privacy and proxy services, the debate has been driven more by anecdote than by data.

Recognizing this as an impediment to resolving the issue, ICANN's GNSO Council has commissioned several studies to collect reliable data on Whois deployment and use, including this study of the effect of proxy and privacy services on access to domain name registrant data.

More Information

- [Initial Findings Presentation on Whois Registrant Identification Study](#) [PDF, 189KB]
- [Background on Whois Studies](#)

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director and Technical Analyst

GNSO to Tackle Policy vs. Implementation – Call for Volunteers

At a Glance

ICANN seeks volunteers to develop a charter for a future working group that will investigate the relationship of policy vs. implementation within ICANN operations.

Recent Developments

The Drafting Team is expected to develop a Charter on the basis of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines taking into account the [Staff Discussion Paper](#) [PDF, 197KB] as well as the discussions that took place in Beijing. At a minimum, the GNSO Council expects that the working group would provide recommendations on the following:

- A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy/implementation related discussions.
- Recommendations on a process for providing GNSO "Policy Guidance."
- A framework for implementation-related discussions related to GNSO Policy Recommendations.
- Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams are expected to function and operate.

Next Steps

The GNSO Council invites interested parties to provide names of expected participants who can then be added to the volunteer drafting team mailing list. Anyone may join. Community members who wish to be invited to join the group should contact the [GNSO secretariat](#).

Background

Implementation of the New gTLD Program brought to light many differences in understanding about which topics call for community policy development and which call for more detailed implementation work, including which processes should be used, at what time and how diverging opinions should be acted upon. For example, when should an issue be vetted through a Policy Development Process (PDP)? When is it appropriate to use public comment, even if the ICANN Board and/or staff may act based on the feedback received? Such questions arose during the evolution of the Applicant Guidebook for the New gTLD Program, and also during the negotiation of key contracts such as the .com and .net registry agreements regarding the impact of potential incorporation of a "thick" Whois registry model.

Similarly, it is not always clear when resolution of a new issue should be supported by community consensus, or, when lacking clear consensus, if the Board of Directors or staff can act after taking a range of advice.

More Information

- [Call for Volunteers](#)
- [Staff Discussion Paper](#)

Staff Contact

[Marika Konings](#), Senior Director, Policy Development Support

ASO

ASO Met in April, Finishing Due Diligence for Board Member Selection



ICANN's Address Supporting Organization (ASO) held its annual in-person meeting at the ICANN 46 Public Meeting in Beijing.

The ASO is finalizing its choice of a Board member for the upcoming three-year term.

There are no global number resource policies under consideration at this time.

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director and Technical Analyst

At-Large

At-Large Community Achievements during ICANN's 46th Meeting in Beijing

At a Glance

The representatives from the At-Large community participated in 27 At-Large meetings during the 46th ICANN Meeting that took place in Beijing, China from 7 to 11 April 2013.

In addition, they held many additional informal working meetings with members of the ICANN community and participated actively in other ICANN Meetings.

These meetings resulted in the achievement of many policy and process-related issues, including the development and ratification of ALAC Policy Advice Statements and further work on process issues which the ALAC and its working groups are currently implementing.

Recent Developments

Among the many policy and process-related issues discussed during their meetings are the following highlights:

- ALAC Policy Activities

During the 46th ICANN Meeting, the ALAC approved six Policy Advice Statements consisting of the following:

- [ALAC Statement on the Preliminary Issue Report on gTLD Registration Data Services](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the ICANN's FY14 Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Proposed 2013 RAA Posted for Comment](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the FY14 Community Travel Support Guidelines](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure \(PICDRP\)](#)
- [ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Metrics Task Force Report](#)

- ALAC Process Issues

Two ALAC Policy Meetings discussed how the Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) and At-Large Working Groups could play a larger role in the ALAC Policy Development.

Updates from the At-Large Working Groups Chairs were presented and next steps discussed.

It was agreed that At-Large staff would work with ALAC Members and RALO officers in highlighting the possible Internet end-user impact of issues that are being asked for in ICANN Public Comment forums.

This was seen as enabling the At-Large Structure representatives to contribute more directly to the At-Large policy advice development process.

- **APRALO Beijing Events**

APRALO held the APRALO Beijing Events series of meetings including a series of joint capacity-building sessions with the ICANN Fellows, a very successful multistakeholder roundtable, a General Assembly, a monthly meeting, and a Showcase and Reception.

- Joint Fellows and APRALO Capacity Building Program - A week-long series of capacity building sessions for APRALO ALS representatives included interactive discussions with AC/SO leaders.
- An [APRALO Multistakeholder Roundtable](#) included recognized speakers from the Asia, Australasia and Pacific region on the topics of the new gTLDs and IDNs was held. This roundtable resulted in excellent discussion with possible follow up at the IGF.
- An [APRALO General Assembly](#), the first since 2011, was held on Tuesday, 9 April. Topics included an update on policy issues of interest to the region, discussion of upcoming elections and regional activities.
- An [APRALO Monthly Meeting](#) was held on Thursday, 11 April. A review of the APRALO Beijing Events was also held, including a detailed discussion of each of the APRALO ALS activities and community evaluation of the Events.
- APRALO held a [Showcase and Reception](#) on the theme of: Celebrating APRALO'S Regional Diversity. Speakers included [Fadi Chehadé](#), ICANN President and CEO and [Steve Crocker](#), Chairman of the Board of ICANN. The event featured a showcase of the activities and cultures of over 25 APRALO At-Large Structures.
- Activities at the local and national level served to highlight their crucial link between the globally diverse At-Large Structures, the five Regional At-Large Organizations and the 15 member ALAC – that together make up the globally diverse At-Large community.

Staff Contact

[Heidi Ullrich](#), Director for At-Large

ALAC Submits Seven Policy Advice Statements in mid-March and late-April

At a Glance

The ALAC continues its high rate of preparing statements in response to ICANN public comments periods as well as comments and communications. Between mid-March and late-April, the ALAC submitted seven statements. The ALAC is currently developing several additional policy advice statements.

Recent Developments

The seven ALAC policy advice statements and communications submitted between mid-March and late April are summarized below.

[ALAC Statement on the Revised New gTLD Registry Agreement Including Additional Public Interest Commitments Specification](#)

- The ALAC remains committed to maximizing benefits and minimizing confusion in the creation of new gTLDs. ALAC believes that significant gTLD growth is necessary to enhance end-user choice and healthy competition in the Internet namespace.
- The revised registry agreement for new gTLDs requires registry compliance with most of the more technical elements included in the gTLD application. However, the registry agreement did not provide mechanisms for turning the public interest statements of an applicant into commitments that were enforceable under the new gTLD registry agreement. The proposed revisions, the subject of this consultation, attempt to address that issue.
- ICANN must be given power to ensure that if an application has public interest components in it, the applicant submits a public interest commitments specification that includes all of those public interest components. The application is the basis on which judgments are made on whether to accept an application, and whether objections should be made.

[ALAC Statement on the At-Large Preliminary Issue Report on gTLD Registration Data Services](#)

- The ALAC notes the release of this Issue Report (IR) that was prepared “pursuant to a Resolution during a Special Meeting of the ICANN Board of 8 November 2012.” ALAC members were in unanimous agreement with the issues identified in the report as germane for crafting an acceptable community solution to gTLD Directory Services. However, ALAC believes that the timeline proposed for community consideration of the report runs counter to the plain terms of the Board resolution.

- By virtue of the plain terms of the Board resolution and since there is no indication that the Expert Working Group “has progressed to a point that it can serve as a basis of work within the PDP,” ALAC believes the IR, even while stamped ‘preliminary,’ may be premature.
- More directly, it could serve to undermine the process the Board has outlined in progressing resolution of the gTLD Data Directory Service issues. The ALAC urges caution on all parties, recommends the IR be recalled and reissued at a later date and reflecting the benefits that may be accrued from the output of the EWG.

[ALAC Statement on the ICANN's FY14 Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework](#)

- The focus of Part B provides excellent detail on the activities of the ICANN Security Team. The ALAC strongly supports the many and varied activities of the ICANN Security Team focused on technical engagement, outreach, training and capability-building both within and beyond the ICANN Community. It is important that funding for these activities continues to be made available in the ICANN Budget.
- Noting that the intention of Part B is to present the SSR activities being undertaken and planned across ICANN the Community, the ALAC suggests that some additional detail of activities being undertaken outside the Security Team would be helpful. While a number of these are mentioned in the document, this tends in some cases to be in the context of the Security Team providing (very worthwhile) support to the activities of other groups, rather than the work of the other groups themselves. The report would benefit from broadening its perspective from ICANN the Organization to ICANN the Community. This can probably be achieved by presenting the existing information in a slightly different way, with slightly more detail.

[ALAC Statement on the Proposed 2013 RAA Posted for Comment](#)

- The ALAC is generally supportive of the RAA and associated specifications as posted for comment. Moreover, the ALAC is generally in agreement with ICANN on the issues where ICANN and Registrars disagree. The proposed RAA is much better than its predecessor. It provides clarity where previously obscurity and even obfuscation ruled, and many of the omissions of earlier RAAs have been addressed. All parties in the current round of negotiations are to be congratulated.
- The ALAC is particularly pleased to see the new sections on Privacy and Proxy registrations; resellers; the Whois Accuracy Program Specification; uniformity of Whois; and a clear, concise simple-language statement of registrant rights and responsibilities. On a process level, the ALAC wishes to commend ICANN staff for presenting this information in such a way and

with multiple views so as to make this very complex set of documents and the differing viewpoints comprehensible.

- That being said, there are a number of issues where the ALAC is uncomfortable with the position that ICANN has taken and the ALAC believes that additional changes are necessary. The issues are examined one-by-one and recommendations made about each issue in the Statement.

[ALAC Statement on the FY14 Community Travel Support Guidelines](#)

- The ALAC clarified the number of supported travelers. Specifically, the fifteen ALAC members, two regional leaders per each of the five RALOs, two Bylaw-mandated Liaisons to GNSO and ccNSO, as well as additional nights for the SSAC Liaison when he/she is already travelling to an ICANN meeting via funding received elsewhere.
- The ALAC also supports the proposed modifications to the travel support policy, specifically fixing firm deadlines for the supported travelers to reply to the emails concerning their participation and the itinerary to be booked.
- The ALAC considers that community members should have normal circumstances for working during their stay. The approved arrival date should be one day before their first working day with sufficient time for rest before starting the work, and their approved departure date should be the day after their last working day.
- The ALAC recognizes that securing visas is the responsibility of the supported travelers; it strongly believes that ICANN should take all necessary actions to facilitate the granting of visas for all the community members. ICANN should negotiate with the host country the modalities for visa procurement for the ICANN community which make it easy for the traveler to apply and to obtain the visa.

[ALAC Statement on the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure \(PICDRP\)](#)

- The ALAC is deeply concerned by the proposed enforcement mechanism for the New gTLD Public Interest Commitments, which appears to be ineffectual by design.
- The ALAC believes that ICANN made a serious mistake in not requiring all new gTLD applicants to stand by their application promises in the form of contractual compliance. ALAC expected that the PIC, despite being a late addition to the application process, would be used as a crucial mechanism to uphold the interest of the public and the end user.
- As proposed, the PIC implementation is weak with features that actively discourage and penalize complainants. The PIC Dispute Resolution Procedure as it is currently presented provides little leverage for the Global Public Interest and it is therefore unacceptable. ALAC

asserts that ICANN must bestow upon the PIC process the true force of responsible and competent enforcement.

[ALAC Statement on the At-Large New gTLD Metrics Task Force Report](#)

- The ALAC found the scope of metrics used by the GNSO to be “too limiting to be effective” in measuring end-user benefit and confidence.
- To be effective, the metrics must evaluate the gTLD program not only between the different registries, but between the use of domain names and alternate methods to access Internet information. To be effective, the metrics must evaluate access to end users of important TLD information, and compare the growth of the DNS to Internet access by other methods such as search engines and Software Defined Networking.
- The metrics proposed by the ALAC are intended to measure the gTLD expansion program from the point of view of Internet end-users, the ALAC's community as defined in ICANN Bylaws. ALAC assumes that the needs of domain buyers and sellers are sufficiently addressed by the GNSO in its metrics.

More Information

- [At-Large Correspondence page](#)
- [At-Large Policy Development page](#)

Staff Contact

[Matt Ashtiani](#), Policy Specialist

GAC

GAC Advice on New gTLDs Delivered in Beijing

At a Glance

GAC sessions at ICANN's public meeting in Beijing were focused on delivering GAC advice to the ICANN Board on categories of strings and specific applications. This advice is detailed in the [Beijing GAC Communiqué](#) [PDF, 159KB].

Background

ICANN receives input from governments through the GAC. The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in

conjunction with ICANN meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.

More Information

- [GAC website](#)

Staff Contact

[Jeannie Ellers](#), ICANN staff

RSSAC

RSSAC Restructure Underway

ICANN's Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) is undergoing a restructure based on recommendations developed from the AC's first ICANN Organizational Review. The Board Structural Improvements Committee, in consultation with the members of the RSSAC, has prepared an ICANN Bylaws amendment. When approved by the Board, the RSSAC will begin the restructure with an expected conclusion on 1 July.

The RSSAC is also defining metrics for assessing the health of the root server system and creating a baseline of data to be used when the new gTLDs begin entering the root zone. This will allow the root server operators to assess changes, if any, that accompany an expanded root zone.

Staff Contact

[Barbara Roseman](#), Policy Director and Technical Analyst

SSAC

SSAC Overview

Background

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee advises the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's

naming and address allocation systems. This includes operational matters (e.g., matters pertaining to the correct and reliable operation of the root name system), administrative matters (e.g., matters pertaining to address allocation and Internet number assignment), and registration matters (e.g., matters pertaining to registry and registrar services such as Whois). SSAC engages in ongoing threat assessment and risk analysis of the Internet naming and address allocation services to assess where the principal threats to stability and security lie, and advises the ICANN community accordingly.

The SSAC produces Reports, Advisories, and Comments on a range of topics. Reports are longer, substantive documents, which usually take a few or several months to develop. Advisories are shorter documents produced more quickly to provide timely advice to the community. Comments are responses to reports or other documents prepared by others, i.e. ICANN staff, SOs, other ACs, or, perhaps, by other groups outside of ICANN. The SSAC considers matters pertaining to the correct and reliable operation of the root name system, to address allocation and Internet number assignment, and to registry and registrar services such as Whois. The SSAC also tracks and assesses threats and risks to the Internet naming and address allocation services.

More Information

- [SSAC website](#)

Staff Contact

[Julie Hedlund](#), Policy Director